

*Remarks*

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable consideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated November 1, 2007, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 11-17 and 19 are now pending in this application, of which Claims 1 and 17 are independent. Claims 2, 5, 7-10, 18 and 20-26 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 11-17, and 19 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the specification, as originally filed. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Initially, Applicants request that acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority be made in light of the certified copy of the priority document submitted on January 8, 2004.

Claims 19, 20 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended Claim 19 to recite "a program stored in a computer-readable recording medium." Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, it was alleged that there was insufficient antecedent basis of the terms "said manipulation procedure," "lower in order," "lower hierarchy," and "higher hierarchy." By this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify each of these features. Applicants submit that there is sufficient antecedent basis for each feature recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-11 and 16-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0057678 (*Jiang et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,150 (*Kamel*). Claims 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jiang et al.* in view of *Kamel* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0250530 (*Tanaka*). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jiang et al.* in view of *Kamel* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,682 (*Eghtesadi et al.*).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is generally directed to an information processing apparatus having a manipulation procedure database, a voice output unit, a determination unit, and a control unit. As noted above, Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jiang et al.* in view of *Kamel*.

*Jiang et al.* teaches a system and method for integrating wireless data and voice calls. Session data is shared between a voice channel and a data channel during a communication session. The Office Action relies on *Jiang et al.* for allegedly teaching a manipulation procedure database in which manipulation procedures selectable by a user are described hierarchically, and acknowledges that *Jiang et al.* is deficient in at least a judging unit and a first voice output unit.

To compensate for these deficiencies, the Office Action relies on *Kamel* to teach the claimed judging unit. *Kamel* generally teaches an interactive voice response and call process application and system for delivering promotional messages. In particular, the Office Action relies on the PIN validation discussed in *Kamel*.

In contrast to the teachings of *Jiang et al.* and *Kamel*, Claim 1 now recites a voice output unit which outputs voice information regarding manipulation procedures, and a determination unit which determines a manipulation procedure selected by the user while the voice output unit is outputting the voice information. Furthermore, the claim also recites a control unit which controls the voice output unit to output voice incorporation relating to a manipulation procedure.

Neither *Jiang et al.* and *Kamel* is understood to teach or suggest these above-noted salient features, among others. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited patents. The other cited patents, namely, *Tanaka* and *Eghtesadi et al.* have been reviewed, but are not understood to teach or suggest the features currently recited in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, none of the cited patents, whether taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests all the features currently recited in independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 17, directed to a related method, is submitted to be patentable for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to independent Claim 1. Dependent Claims 3, 4, 6, 11-16 and 19 are also submitted to be patentable by virtue of their dependencies on an allowable claim, as well as for the additional features they recite. Individual consideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ann M. McCamey/

---

Ann M. McCamey  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 57,016

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
AMM/ntb

FCHS\_WS 1948624v1